Case 3:10-cv-00078-RCJ-WGC Document 55 Filed 01/09/12 Page 1 of 2

Case 3:10-cv-00078-RCJ-WGC Document 55 Filed 01/09/12 Page 2 of 2

On November 21, 2011, the defendants filed objections to the report and recommendation (#46). On December 12, 2011, the plaintiff filed a response (#53) to the defendants' objections.

On a motion to dismiss, the court reviews a complaint to see if, on its face, it contains sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a plausible claim for relief. Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009). Where a plaintiff appears pro se, the court construes the pleadings liberally and "afford[s the] plaintiff the benefit of any doubt." Karim-Panahi v. L.A. Police Dep't, 839 F.2d 621, 623 (9th Cir. 1988).

With these standards in mind, the court has considered the pleadings and memoranda of the parties and other relevant matters of record. It has made a review and determination in accordance with the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 636 and applicable case law. Therefore, and good cause appearing, the defendants' motion to dismiss (#33) the plaintiff's claims for damages against the defendants in their official capacities is granted. In all other respects, the defendants' motion to dismiss is denied. It is further ordered that plaintiff be given thirty (30) days within which to serve Defendant Bryant or he will be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Rule 4(m).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 9th day of January, 2012.

Howard DMEKiller

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE